IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Steven Vue,

Petitioner,

v.

United States Attorney General, et al.,

Respondents.

No. CV-22-01365-PHX-DWL

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Petitioner's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Doc. 4) and the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of the United States Magistrate Judge (Doc. 13). The R&R, which was issued on March 30, 2023 recommended that the amended petition be denied and further provided that "[t]he parties shall have fourteen days from the date of service of a copy of this recommendation within which to file specific written objections with the Court." (Doc. 13 at 5.)

Here, no such objections have been filed. Thus, the Court accepts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. *See, e.g., Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985) ("It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."); *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) ("[N]o review is required of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation unless objections are filed."). *See also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)

Case 2:22-cv-01365-DWL Document 14 Filed 04/25/23 Page 2 of 2

("[T]he district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise."). Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the R&R's recommended disposition (Doc. 13) is accepted, that the Amended Petition (Doc. 4) is denied, and that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability and leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal be denied. Dated this 24th day of April, 2023. Dominic W. Lanza United States District Judge